ECS 20 — Lecture 12 — Fall 2013 — 5 Nov 2013

Phil Rogaway

Today:

Functions, continued:

- o Some functions that arise often in CS
- o Comparing the size of infinite sets

Announcements:

o Dog day next Tuesday! BYOD.

Review

Domain. Co-domain. Range.

Injective (1-1) and surjective (onto) and bijective.

Notation: Sometimes you might want to show that f takes x to y, a to 2a, etc. Don't use a \rightarrow symbol for that; write $x \mapsto y$, $a \mapsto 2a$. With surrounding English, this reads ok. But saying a \rightarrow 2a definitely does not.

Some computer scientists like to denote functions by "lambda expressions"

To say that f is the function that maps x to x^2 we write

$$f = \lambda x. x^2$$

Here *x* is just a formal variable;

The domain is not mentioned explicitly

Functions don't have to be defined on numbers, of course; eg,

$$|.|:\Sigma^{\star}\to N$$

hd(x) = the first character of the string x, or ERROR if $x = \varepsilon$

 $tl(x) = all but the first character of x (and <math>\varepsilon$ when $x = \varepsilon$)?

dim(A) = the dimensions of the matrix *A*, regarded as a pair of natural numbers

Functions can take any number of arguments - which we think of as forming the cross product.

Example: max:
$$N^2 \rightarrow N$$

Functions can have domains that are complex sets,

$$\max: \bigcup_{i \in \{1,2,...\}} \mathbf{N}^i \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$$

$$\delta^*$$
: $Q \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow Q$

Formally, the domain is the cross product, but we don't routinely write things like $\delta^*((q, x))$; we write $\delta^*(q, x)$, understanding the function to operate on the pair.

It is also common, for some function, to switch to infix notation: a+b, rather than +(a,b) (or, even worse, +((a,b))).

Function composition

```
f \circ g

f: A \rightarrow B, g: B \rightarrow C

then (g \circ f): A \rightarrow C is defined by (g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x))
```

Kind of "backwards", but fairly tradition. Some mathematicians (eg, in algebra) will reverse it, (x) ($f \circ g$) "function operates on the left"

Inverse of a function

```
If f(x) = y we say that x is a preimage of y
Does every point in the codomain have a preimage?
No, only points in the image.
Does every point in the image have one preimage?
No, only if it's an injective function
Does every point the in the domain have an image?
Yes, that's required for being a function.
Might it have two images?
No, only one.
```

If you do have a **bijective** function $f: A \to B$ then the function $f^{-1}: B \to A$ is well defined: $f^{-1}(y) =$ the unique x such that f(x) = y.

```
Example: f(x) = \exp(x) = e^x
Draw picture.
What's the domain? R
What's the range / image? (0, \infty)
Is it 1-1 on this image? YES
What's it's inverse? y \mapsto \ln(y)
```

Some important functions in CS

```
Law x = a \mod b gcd (a,b) // Calculating this: Assume a \ge b. If b = 0 then return 0. Else return gcd(b, a \mod b). a \mod b \le a/2. (If b \le a/2, then a \mod b \le a/2; if b > a/2 then a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. Law a \mod b = a - b \le a/2. La
```

Talk about the term **partial** (vs total) function gcd(a,b) = gcd(b, a mod b)

Proposition [Biggs, p. 35]: *Every nonempty* $X \subseteq N = \{1, 2, ...\}$ *has a minimum.*

Proof. Let P(n) = "every subset X of \mathbb{N} containing n has a least number." Since X is nonempty, it suffice to show P(n) for all $n \ge 1$.

Induction:

Basis: P(1) is true because 1 is the minimum element of **N**.

Inductive step (strong induction). Suppose P(1), ..., P(k) is true; must show P(k+1). So $k+1 \in X$.

Case 1: for all $x \in X$, x>k. Then $k+1 = \min X$.

Case 2. for some $x \in X$, $x \le k$. By inductive assumption, X has a least number.

```
Review properties of logs: // forgot to do in class
  log(ab) = log(a) + log(b)
  log_a(b) = log_c(b) / log_c(a)
  e^ab = (e^a)^b
  a^x a^y = a^{x+y}
Draw picture of y = lg(x)
```

Equicardinal sets

Sets A and B are **equicardinal** (or **equinumerous** or **equipotent**), written |A|=|B| or $A \sim B$, if there exists a bijection π : $A \rightarrow B$.

Claim: this is an equivalence relation.

T/F: There is a bijection from A to B iff there is a bijection from B to A)

A set is finite if it is empty or equipotent with $\{1, ..., n\}$ for some natural number n

A set is **infinite** if it is not finite.

A set is **countably infinite** if it is equipotent with **N**.

Write $|A| = \aleph_0$

That symbol is called a cardinal number.

If
$$|A| = \aleph_i$$
 then $|\mathcal{P}(A)| = \aleph_{i+1}$

So the numbers you know about are 0, 1, 2, ..., \aleph_0 , $c = \aleph_1$, \aleph_2 , ...

Use |A| < |B| if there is an injection but no bijection from A to B.

```
Theorem [Cantor] |A| < |\mathcal{P}(A)|
```

Theorem [Schroeder-Bernstein] If $|A| \le |B|$ and $|B| \le |A|$ then |A| = |B|.

Examples:

- $\{0,1,...\} \sim \{1,2,...\}$
- Show that the natural numbers and the integers are equicardinal
- Show that the rationals and the integers are equicardinal
- Infinitely many hotel rooms, room 1, room2,

In comes a new customer. Can you accommodate him (perhaps with a bit of inconvenience to existing customers?

Yes, shift everyone over. Showing a bijection from **N** to **N** \cup {new}.

- Same but now infinitely many new customers arrive, new1, new2, ... No problem: $n \mapsto 2n$ and we slot the new customers in at the odd positions. Show how to write it.
- Strings and numbers

Real numbers - can't be done. Let us now show this.

Diagonalization

- Prove that the set of **reals** is not countable. Focus on numbers in [0,1], Change chosen digit d to d+2 mod 10 along the diagonal.
- Prove that the set of languages over {0,1}* is not countable.
 Cor: there are languages that no computer program can recognize. (didn't get to this)
- Prove Cantor's theorem (didn't get to this).

These proofs – really the same proof – illustrate diagonalizatoin. Used to prove Cantor's theorem, above, as well:

Proof of Cantor's theorem, from Wikipedia [Cantor's Theorem]: To establish Cantor's theorem it is enough to show that, for any given set *A*, no function *f* from *A* into the <u>power set</u> of *A*, can be <u>surjective</u>, i.e. to show the existence of at least one subset of *A* that is not an element of the <u>image</u> of *A* under *f*. Such a subset is given by the following construction:

$$B = \{ x \in A : x \not\in f(x) \}.$$

This means, by definition, that for all x in A, $x \in B$ if and only if $x \notin f(x)$. For all x the sets B and f(x) cannot be the same because B was constructed from elements of A whose images (under f) did not include themselves. More specifically, consider any $x \in A$, then either $x \in f(x)$ or $x \notin f(x)$. In the former case, f(x) cannot equal B because $x \in f(x)$ by assumption and $x \notin B$ by the construction of B. In the latter case, f(x) cannot equal B because $x \notin f(x)$ by assumption and $x \in B$ by the construction of B.

Thus there is no x such that f(x) = B; in other words, B is not in the image of f. Because B is in the power set of A, the power set of A has a greater cardinality than A itself.

The continuum hypothesis [Wikipedia entry)

The <u>continuum hypothesis</u> (CH) states that there are no cardinals strictly between \aleph_0 and $2^{\aleph_0} = \mathfrak{c}$, the <u>cardinality of the continuum</u> (the set of <u>real numbers</u>). The <u>generalized continuum hypothesis</u> (GCH) states that for every infinite set X, there are no cardinals strictly between |X| and $2^{|X|}$. The continuum hypothesis is independent of the usual axioms of set theory, the Zermelo-Fraenkel axioms, together with the axiom of choice (ZFC).